

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action dated May 19, 2005.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, on a variety of grounds which are set forth in paragraphs 1-4 of the Office Action.

The Office Action, in paragraphs 5 and 6 thereof, requests the applicant to respond to specific questions raised by the Examiner.

This Communication follows a lengthy telephone interview with the Examiner on May 26, 2005. The courtesies extended to the applicant's undersigned representative during the interview and the opportunity to have engaged in an in-depth discussion of the application are greatly appreciated.

For reasons not altogether understood by the applicant, the Examiner somehow came to believe that the movements that are described in the instant specification are special movements which do not rotate each of the watch handles at a constant speed and that this is some sort of an "elliptical" movement. No such description appears in the specification and, indeed, applicant's undersigned representative is not aware of the existence of such "elliptical" movements.

To the contrary, the specification describes conventional analog time movements and such movements are well known throughout the industry for hundreds of years to comprise watch or clock handles, each of which moves at a constant speed.

The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to the sentence in paragraph number [0016] of the instant specification which explains the applicant's use of the watch, such that:

"...the user determines the actual time in Paris, at the same instant of time by mentally capturing a second image of the second time piece, mentally moving this second captured image toward the [geometric] center of the dial face, and reading the hours indicia pointed to by the minute and hour handles of the second time movement."

Regardless of whether the Examiner's observation that users would not want such a watch that requires "mental moving" of the image of the time movement to the geometric center of the dial face, it is nonetheless a fact that the structure now set forth in the amended claims is different from anything in the prior art.

Thus, claim 1 is directed to a dial face that includes a series of hour indicia arranged and following the circumferential boundary and surrounding the interior region of the dial face.

Within that dial face are mounted first and second time movements -- which are, of course, as noted above and as described in the specification, conventional time movements -- and these are arranged in spaced relationship to each other and such that each movement is settable and runs independently of the other and each movement is spaced away from the geometric center of the dial face. Applicant is not aware of any watch having these "structural" features in the prior art.

Relative to claim 1, to respond to the Office Action and to take into account the Examiner's comment during the interview, the text reciting that the hours and minute handles of each movement operate "in conjunction with a series of hours indicia", has been removed from the claim.

The applicant has also canceled claim 3 and claim 8, the latter for the reasons that there is no antecedent basis for "the stones".

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is believed and respectfully submitted that the applicant has fully responded to the §112, first paragraph questions raised by the Examiner. That is, the patent specification very exactly and specifically describes the structure required to make the claimed invention. Similarly, the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention.

In addition, it is noted that in this application the Examiner has rejected claims 22-29 on the same basis as the other claims. However, claim 22 does not recite a pair of time movements and does not recite any association between handles of a time movement and the series of hour indicia. Regardless, the applicant has now amended claim 22 and requests formal examination thereof on the merits. Claim 30 is identical to claim 21 in co-pending application serial no. 10/783,300, as are claims 1-2, 4-7 and 9-20.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, including by comparing the claimed subject matter to any prior art which the Examiner may locate, allow the claims as amended and pass this case to issue in due course.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on June 15, 2005:

MAX MOSKOWITZ

Name of applicant, assignee or
Registered Representative

Signature

June 15, 2005

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

MAX MOSKOWITZ

Registration No.: 30,576

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700